

Reviewing The History Of The Bible

By Pastor Daniel Waite, M.A., M.Div.

Given at the 39th Annual Meeting Of The Dean Burgon Society

At Bible Baptist Church, Marietta, Georgia

July 26, 2017

I want to thank everyone at Bible Baptist Church in Marietta for having us here this year. It's always nice to be here and always nice to participate in the various activities of the Dean Burgon Society. There are very nice people here at Bible Baptist. Thank you, Pastor Cooper, for everything. Thank you to Mrs. Cooper and all the ladies down in the kitchen, for cooking for us, and for allowing us to have this meeting in your church.

I'm going to be talking about a quick review of the book, *Forever Settled: A Survey of the Documents and History of the Bible* by Dr. Jack Moorman. He is a member of our DBS Executive Committee. He lives in England. In fact, a year and a half ago, some of the people in our church were going through this book.

Dr. Moorman reminded the readers that originally, when God gave the law of Moses, the Ten Commandments, He wrote them with His own finger. He had to write them twice because Moses broke the first stone tables the first time. God had to rewrite them. That law of God was stored in the most holy place, the Holy of Holies. It was placed in probably the most sacred of all pieces of furniture in the Holy of Holies, the ark of the covenant. The Words of God, the law of God, was placed there.

Dr. Moorman talked about, in Isaiah 7:14, how modern translations of the Bible, took that word, "*virgin*," referring to Mary, the human mother of our Lord Jesus Christ, and changed it to "*married woman*." Mary was not a married woman. She was espoused to Joseph but she was not married. She was a virgin, there was a supernatural virgin conception, and a supernatural virgin birth. Many modern Bibles today, want to remove this doctrine.

The birth of Christ is very important according the prophecy in Isaiah 7:14. It teaches clearly that the mother of the Lord Jesus Christ would have a virgin conception and a virgin birth.

Dr. Moorman talks about Jerome, when he translated the Latin Vulgate, included the Apocrypha. The Apocrypha contains many extra-Biblical books. The pagan institution of Rome embraces these extra-Biblical books and put them on the same plane as Scripture. They wrongly make them equal to the genuine books of the Bible.

For historical purposes, in the early editions of the King James Bible they were included but not in the same order. They were included for historical reference only. I think if they were to be used for historical reference, they could have had a separate volume. But nonetheless, they were in there to start with but then they were finally removed from the English King James Bible.

Dr. Moorman brings up the idea of the naturalistic approach to translation or to other things. Naturalism tries to look to nature for an answer to the supernatural. whatever it might be. The modern Bible translations do not want to look to God for an answer, but to nature. The naturalistic critic looks at the Scripture and says:

"That's wrong. This is wrong." Earlier, Dr. DiVietro was talking about what the lower critics do. Sadly, they criticize the text of the Bible and say various words and verses *"don't really belong in the Bible."*

There is an online class in New Testament Survey at Yale University. This professor's approach is to make the Bible like any other book. He wants to look at the Bible using a naturalistic approach. The Bible is a supernatural Book. We cannot bring this supernatural Book down into a natural level and try to have a human explanation for things for which we do not have a human explanation. They want to give themselves an excuse why they do not have to accept the Bible's truth. They're looking for all the reasons to support their position. For example Dr. Moorman cited, on page 32, that these people say there are mistakes and errors in the book of Genesis. He continues on in his discussion giving some examples in some of the early Bible translations. He cited some Bibles that were called Targums. A Targum is a sort of an oral tradition that eventually was written down. For a while they had an oral version of the Bible. It wasn't in print. It was just something that was orally passed down from generation to generation until it finally was written down.

One parent would tell their children in thorough detail of certain things about the Scripture and that child would continue to tell the grandchildren. So we have these Aramaic paraphrases of these accounts in Scripture but not necessarily Scripture, per se, but they are kind of Scripture. But one thing that these Targums excluded was any reference to God. There is a danger sometimes today with people who are Jewish. They are trying to follow the law of Moses. They want to avoid certain things. Especially do they want to get around Isaiah 53. Moorman points out that there is a very early translation in Syria called the Syriac Peshitta. Its date is very very close to the original source materials.

What the modern textual critic wants to do is to go down to Egypt for all their support. The Scripture was not given in Syriac, but given in the Hebrew, the Aramaic, and the Greek. The Peshitta was a Bible translation that was available for the early Christians that were living in that region. The Peshitta, we're told, omitted the Apocrypha. Dr. Moorman has an interesting discussion on page 44 about the Dead Sea Scrolls. Some people, he points out, that the Dead Sea Scrolls were dated about 140 B.C. He quotes from G. R. Driver. Driver disagrees with the interpretation which Albright, Burrows, Cross, and other scholars have placed upon the Dead Sea Scrolls, denying that these documents date far from pre-Christian times. He relates them instead to the Jewish revolt against Rome in AD 66-73, thus making them roughly contemporary with the New Testament. The Dead Sea Scrolls have excerpts from every book of the Bible except the book of Esther. They also have extra-Biblical books and the 151st Psalm as well.

Some people are familiar with Westcott and Hort. They were opposed to the truth and the gospel. In fact, they seem to be almost opposed to salvation by grace through faith in Christ alone. Westcott and Hort viewed manuscript B and Aleph as entirely pure Greek manuscripts. How can these two men, view B and Aleph as entirely pure when it has been documented that they disagree with each other in over 3,000 places in the Gospels alone. How they be considered "pure"?

I guess if they tell enough people enough times, then maybe some people will start believing that these two manuscripts are pure when they are not pure. Westcott and Hort did a pretty good job in 1881 convincing many people of their views. Today there is a big, huge division in Bible-believing circles about Westcott and Hort.

On page 54, Dr. Moorman talks about the neutral method. The neutral method leads to the denial of the inspiration of Scripture. When anyone starts talking about how the Bible can be fixed, or how the Bible can

be repaired, or how the Bible is weak in this point--ultimately that's causing them to deny the fact that the Bible is inspired. Inerrancy is a very important doctrine. We must know and understand that the Bible is without error in all aspects that it teaches, whether historical, scientific, or in any other areas. No matter what the Bible talks about, it is accurate in all matters in which it speaks. Some want to have a naturalistic reason as to how we got all these documents together.

They're trying to poke holes in the Words of God. They do not want to accept the Words of God as Scripture. So someone like Evangelist William Sunday, as Dr. Moorman mentions, believed that the Bible was filled with myths, legends and vague approximations. Sad to say, William Sunday was a disciple of Westcott and Hort. He called the Scripture just a bunch of myths, legends, and approximations. He considered the Bible as if it were just like any other book. Like the professor at Yale, he wants to have his students look at the Bible like any other book. And not just Yale, but many other schools and many other professors take this same false position. They consider the Bible to be just like any other book.

Now, interestingly enough, on page 59, Dr. Moorman observes the fact that the first individual to use the term "New Testament" was Tertullian. So we have the Old Testament and the New Testament. Make sure you have a Bible that doesn't have a separation between these two Testaments. We were talking about that in our Executive Committee today as far as some Bibles are concerned. The Bible is complete. There is no division between the two of them. And if you have our *Defined King James Bible*, all the Words of the Lord Jesus Christ are in black. When someone calls me up and asks me if we have a Red Letter Edition of the Bible, I tell them no. In our *Defined King James Bible*, all the words of the Lord Jesus Christ are in black. He gave the Words to God the Holy Spirit and the Holy Spirit gave the Words to the human writers according to John 16:12-14.

"I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you." (John 16:12-14)

At one point in time, before we had the moveable type, people would have to write things out by hand. These manuscripts were very expensive because a scribe had to write that book out by hand. It was a very very tedious process. It was a very expensive thing to go through and to buy a Bible because it was all done by hand. Erasmus, Stephanos and Beza were able to have the Greek New Testament printed.

It's a very very important to have the preserved Words of God. If you're going to believe and teach the inspiration of the Scriptures, then that would lead to the idea that the preservation of the Scriptures would also be necessary. How odd is it to say that God inspired something, but then He failed to preserve it. Some people convey the bold statement that "*God inspired these Words a long time ago but now we are left not knowing if we have what these words are or not.*" That position doesn't make sense.

Preservation is very important. It's very important at any time period of our lives, or at any time period of history, whether a 100 years ago, 200 years ago, 300 years ago. Preservation of the Words of God should always be important to us in this century as well. There are many people who want to be very lax in their approach to the Scripture--how they view the Scripture, how they view the way they want to live, how they view the way they want to do anything. They take a very casual approach to many things, especially to the inspiration and preservation of the Words of the Bible.

To have casualness in churches today leads to casualness in the approach to the Words of God and how we have to accept the Words of God as authority. We should not be casual about anything. We have to accept the Bible as being God's preserved Words. There is an accountability that we have to God's words. We have to be obedient to the Words of God because God has preserved His Words.

Dr. Moorman brings up papyri on page 63 because some manuscripts that we have are written on papyri. Papyri come from the papyrus plant. It's a plant that grew by the Nile River. They were able to take this plant and fashion it in such a way that they would be able to write on it. This is the way people were able to read things and write on things, on these different papyri.

In the 19th century we have the so-called discovery by Tischendorf in St. Catherine's Monastery in 1859. Dr. Moorman brings this up. In our class we had a whole other discussion if this is the real Mount Sinai or not. We concluded it was not the real Mount Sinai that St. Catherine's is on. Nonetheless, (although present evidence says the Sinai manuscript is only made to look ancient, but was dressed up in recent years and made to look much older) Tischendorf allegedly discovered these manuscripts. Manuscript Aleph is one of the manuscripts that Westcott and Hort say are pure. Tischendorf persuaded the monks to give it as a present to the Tsar of Russia. Did you hear that? Tischendorf gave this as a present to the Tsar of Russia. That was back in 1859.

Again, Dr. Moorman talks about the Peshitta on page 66. The Peshitta was long regarded as one of the most ancient New Testament versions being accorded a second century date. So the Peshitta is very early. The reason we want to go to these early versions is because they are translations of early original manuscripts. The Peshitta is a translation of the Scripture, probably from a first or second generation copy of the New Testament Scriptures. If there's a translation of a particular passage that wasn't in one of those so-called "pure" Manuscript B or Aleph, as Westcott and Hort allege, you look at an early translation and it's there. Where did it come from? It was there in the original text that was omitted by the Vatican (B) and/or the Sinai (Aleph) manuscripts.

As Dr. DiVietro mentioned a moment ago, as far as Mark 16:9-20, the space that's missing. You know, it should shout out to people saying, "*Why isn't it here?*" They had so many letters across and so many lines down and they left just that exact amount of blank space. Those verses would fit exactly in that blank column space. If we look at some of these older translations of Scripture, they had these 12 verses of Mark. It was there for them. They had Greek manuscripts that had these verses and they included them. People today want to do everything they can to dismiss the authority of Scripture. We have to accept what God has written. We have to accept that it is the truth and we have to be obedient to His Words. We cannot go in the wrong direction, we have to be obedient to His Words.

The Peshitta is very very important. manuscript. It's the Syriac translation dating from the second century A.D. We also have the Gothic translation also. We've heard this before on Dr. Moorman's page 71, but we should hear it again. Perhaps some of us have not heard it. Dr. Moorman says over 85% of the more than 5,000 manuscripts that are in existence fall into the category of the Received Text. but the modern-day textual critic, the way they try to get around this fact is they...and really these manuscripts, the funny thing with manuscripts, many of them are independent manuscripts, not necessarily copies of each other, but what the modern textual critic wants to say, they have invented as Dr. DiVietro said before, they invented a scheme of some set of rules that always makes them win. So they have this family of texts. They want this family. They've got four families of texts. They say: "We want to be fair and have equal representation." They are

not fair, however. In their list of manuscripts they have only Vatican (B) and Sinai (Aleph) and perhaps 37 more. The manuscripts underlying the Received Text number over 5,000. This is less than 1% versus over 99% of the evidence. It's very odd that they're doing this, Westcott and Hort have falsely said that B and Aleph are the most pure manuscripts they've ever seen.

Hoskier is the one who made the comparison there with B and Aleph, how they differ from each other 3,000 times in just the four Gospels alone. So we see that Dr. Moorman brings in a thought from Scrivener who believed that the corruptions of the manuscripts were introduced into the texts of Scripture within the first or second century. Different men have various views on this, but nonetheless, the bottom line is there was a very early corruption of the New Testament Greek manuscripts.

Dr. Moorman said, on page 84, that the existence of the Alexandrian Egyptian text is unproved and probably untrue. On the other hand, the Received Text came from all over the ancient world. So when we have the Alexandrian text, that remained right there locally in Alexandria, Egypt. But when the Received Text was found all over the Mediterranean. It went all over the place. To use this argument is not being fair in the minds of Westcott and Hort who think B and Aleph are the most pure manuscripts ever.

Dr. Moorman mentions Dean Burgon on page 94. He describes how he collated and gathered over 86,000 quotations from the early Church Fathers. He noticed how these early Church Fathers quoted passages that are missing in modern-day corrupted manuscripts. Dr. Moorman points out that in Mark 1:1-2, that there is a translation problem and there are translation problems all throughout modern Bibles. Yet the translation problem is that in Mark 1:1-2, the Bible says,

*"The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; **As it is written in the prophets**, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee."*

The ESV and some other modern translations, say, "*As it is written Isaiah the prophet.*" They don't say, "*As it is **written in the prophets**.*" Now, the problem with this, yes, it is in Isaiah 40:3 but it is also in Malachi 3:1. So "***written in the prophets***" is an acceptable translation. It is the correct and accurate translation of that passage there in Mark 1.

Dean Burgon cataloged over 86,000 quotations from the early Church Fathers. He said that Tertullian quoted John 5:3-4 using the Received Text Words as we have it in the King James Bible. Dean Burgon has all sorts of things that give support of the existence of proper readings and the proper support of the Received Text.

The passage in 1 Timothy 3:16 should read "***God** was manifest in the flesh.*" It should not be "***he** appeared in a body.*" This removes "God" (THEOS) and remove the Incarnation of the Lord Jesus Christ. These Gnostics heretics who altered the Scriptures did not believe in the Incarnation, so they removed "*God*" and turned it into only "*he*" (HOS). They do this in some 356 doctrinal passages in the New Testament and take away different parts of different doctrines so that all you have is a natural book. The Bible is not a natural book. It is a supernatural book.

*"Great is the mystery of God. **God** was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed unto the world, and received up into glory."*

There are many different ways to catalog manuscripts. Someone cataloged these documents by P for papyri, P66, P75, and they number these manuscripts. Some of these papyri manuscripts in this example that

Dr. Jack Moorman gave us page 107. He said that in both P66 and P75 they removed the words "*the Son of Man who is in heaven.*" This wording denies the omnipresence and Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ. They remove many things from the Bible. It's just like the professor at Yale. He's going to go in that direction and he's going to be very very very critical of the Scripture. He's a well-spoken person but yet many of his students will be misled and deceived. Their view and approach to the New Testament will be forever changed unless the Holy Spirit intervenes and convinces them of their need of salvation and shows them the truth. There is even hope for the professor to turn around.

But when people today want to take people in the wrong direction, there are hundreds of Bible translations out there to take them in this wrong direction. Almost all of them are based upon improper Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek texts. They also use a shoddy method of Bible translation so that people do not get an accurate representation of what the Words of God are. It's a false representation of what God's Words actually say. We need to have a clearer, a proper translation of God's Words such as is found in the King James Bible.

Dr. Moorman points out how many of very important doctrinal terms have been removed. He has compiled a work which lists 8,000 differences between the Gnostic Critical text of Westcott and Hort (**BFT #3084 @ \$29.00 + \$7.00 S&P**). He has another book, (*Early MSS, Church Fathers & The Authorized Version*) (**BFT #3230 @ \$20.00 + \$7.00 S&H**) that lists 356 doctrinal passages that modern Bibles change. They change very important doctrines of the Scripture.

Dr. Moorman continues on with talking about some papyrus manuscripts P-55 and P-45 on page 107. He says that the editor in describing P45, prefers the simple to the compound word. In short, he favors brevity. He shortens the texts in at least 50 places in a single reading alone. We see how people want to shorten things. I remember, in a class I had in college, that they were trying to present the argument that the shorter is the better. They were trying to present that argument. But that's not the case at all. You have to have the textual support and the Received Text has the much greater Greek manuscript support for the Greek New Testament.

Dr. Moorman talks about the manuscripts. He wants to distinguish between the minuscules (those in small letters) and Uncials (those in all capital letters). This book by Dr. Jack Moorman gives a good overall introduction, a good overall history of the Bible, and many good and important details of things that you can think about in the overall umbrella issues and defense of Traditional Bible Texts that underlie our King James Bible.

We come again to Codex Sinaiticus (Aleph). Dr. Moorman says, on page 113,

"It is commonly said to be the only uncial manuscript which contains the entire New Testament but it must be remembered that it omits John 5:4, John 8:1-14, Matthew 16:2-3, Romans 16:24, Mark 16:9-20 and hundreds of other words and phrases which are commonly removed from the Alexandrian texts."

So when you have the Greek basis for of today's modern Bibles, they are still basically and foundationally based on Westcott and Hort's text which is basically based on the combination of B and Aleph, with all the words that are either missing or changed, it's very unsettling.

On page 113, Moorman says it is found that at least 10 revisers between the 4th and 12th centuries busy themselves with the task of correcting its many and extraordinary perversions of the true Scripture. Ten of them, probably over 10 of them. That was their job. They wanted to come and correct, so-called correct. They

wanted to soften. They wanted to pervert the words of God.

Hoskier has pointed out that in the four Gospels alone, there are over 3,000 differences between the Greek manuscripts Vatican (B) and Sinai (Aleph). On page 121, Dr. Moorman said that Dr. Stewart Custer (a former professor for many years from Bob Jones University) said that said: "*God preserved His word in the sands of Egypt.*" He believes that the God's Words were preserved in the sands of Egypt. He is referring to the and likes Alexandrian text. The Westcott and Hort false Greek text manuscripts originated in Alexandria, Egypt. He goes right along with the Westcott and Hort text, with all the modern Bible thinkers, and with many many modern Bible versions based upon those flawed Greek manuscripts. Dr. Custer got these lies from his teachers who got them for their teachers, and on and on. They were all directed in the wrong way to the wrong Greek sources.

Though today, Bob Jones University, is far closer to many of the Bible truths than Yale University (or many other universities are), yet all of these schools, in their Bible departments and their Greek departments, have wrongly accepted the same false Gnostic Critical Greek text as a basis for their New Testament Words. They come to the same conclusion basically--that the Greek foundation of the New Testament Scripture is not known for certain. Because of this, the foundation of the Scripture can be questioned by these schools; and consequently can be ultimately ignored. If you tell your students something about how there are a bunch of problems in the Received Text, or in the King James Bible, it won't be too long before the students might say:

"Wait a minute. If there are all these problems and questions, why should I bother to accept the Bible at all?"

It's better to take the text that's the Received Text and not these texts that are "restored," and have been so-called "*preserved*" in the sands of Egypt, as Dr. Custer has said.

Dr. Moorman talks about Origen whose teacher was Clement of Alexandria. Origen was one of Clement's most famous students. He talks a little bit more about Scrivener on page 157. He does more talking about the apocrypha on 136. He brings in the Waldensians and there is a controversy about who the true Waldensians are and how they began. On page 141, Dr. Moorman talks about the very old Waldensians' liturgy which they used in their services down through the centuries. This liturgy contained verses and words of Scripture from the ancient Italic version. These are the words are found in the lectionaries of their church services. When you have quotes of verses and Words in these lectionaries that missing in the false Gnostic Critical text of Westcott and Hort, how did these verses and Words get there? They were there in the original Greek text and the Gnostic revisers of Alexandria, Egypt, took them away. They weren't added. They were taken away. They were corrupted.

On page 145, Dr. Moorman said that Jerome, in his early years, was brought up with an enmity against the Received texts. At the time, it was known universally as the Greek Vulgate. This is not to be confused with the Latin Vulgate This Greek Vulgate was accepted by the churches, but Jerome was opposed to it. He was brought up with this opposition to the Received Text. So he made up his Latin Vulgate. It took over 900 years to be accepted by many. That's quite a long time but it was accepted. It is highly regarded by many people that are in the pagan institution of Rome.

Dr. Moorman, on page 181, observes that when the English translation of 1881 came off the press in England, the Chicago Tribune, on May 22, 1881, published the entire 1881 New Testament in their paper. This is, of course, a false New Testament based upon the false Gnostic Critical Greek text. Today, the Chicago Tribune wouldn't get anywhere near close to doing this. But the entire New Testament over there in England

was put in the Chicago newspaper which was an interesting thing Moorman brought up.

Dr. Moorman, on page 189, brings up the point of how, in the 15th century, we had the invention of printing, and also the perfection of the development and manufacture of paper. They both came into their best availability at the same time. So, at that time, you had the printing press and also the paper to print words on. They could run the words through the press, even though the presses were nothing like today's printing presses are. Nonetheless, they were something that was far more advanced than copying books by hand. We know the first book that Gutenberg printed was the Latin Vulgate.

Before the printing press came into existence, there were only handwritten manuscripts. Dr. Moorman said It would take about 10 months to copy the Bible. It would cost about 40 to 50 pounds to purchase the copy of this Bible. It was a very tedious and difficult task to copy this by hand. The printing press saved a lot of time and makes books have more value to them.